

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
TYLER DIVISION**

<b>AZURE NETWORKS, LLC,</b>	§	
	§	<b>CASE NO. 6:15-cv-18</b>
<b>V.</b>	§	<b>PATENT CASE</b>
	§	
<b>ACER AMERICA CORPORATION AND</b>	§	
<b>ACER INC.</b>	§	
<hr/>		
<b>AZURE NETWORKS, LLC,</b>	§	
	§	<b>CASE NO. 6:15-cv-19</b>
<b>V.</b>	§	<b>PATENT CASE</b>
	§	
<b>SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA,</b>	§	
<b>INC. ET AL</b>	§	
<hr/>		
<b>AZURE NETWORKS, LLC,</b>	§	
	§	<b>CASE NO. 6:15-cv-20</b>
<b>V.</b>	§	<b>PATENT CASE</b>
	§	
<b>AMAZON.COM INC.</b>	§	
<hr/>		
<b>AZURE NETWORKS, LLC,</b>	§	
	§	<b>CASE NO. 6:15-cv-23</b>
<b>V.</b>	§	<b>PATENT CASE</b>
	§	
<b>HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY</b>	§	
<hr/>		
<b>AZURE NETWORKS, LLC,</b>	§	
	§	<b>CASE NO. 6:15-cv-24</b>
<b>V.</b>	§	<b>PATENT CASE</b>
	§	
<b>HTC CORPORATION ET AL</b>	§	
<hr/>		
<b>AZURE NETWORKS, LLC,</b>	§	
	§	<b>CASE NO. 6:15-cv-25</b>
<b>V.</b>	§	<b>PATENT CASE</b>
	§	
<b>LG ELECTRONICS MOBILECOMM USA,</b>	§	
<b>INC. ET AL</b>	§	
<hr/>		
<b>AZURE NETWORKS, LLC,</b>	§	
	§	<b>CASE NO. 6:15-cv-26</b>
<b>V.</b>	§	<b>PATENT CASE</b>
	§	
<b>PANASONIC CORPORATION ET AL</b>	§	

<b>AZURE NETWORKS, LLC</b>	§
V.	§ CASE NO. 6:15-cv-27
	§ PATENT CASE
	§
<b>SONY ELECTRONICS, INC. ET AL</b>	§
	§
<b>AZURE NETWORKS, LLC,</b>	§
V.	§ CASE NO. 6:15-cv-28
	§ PATENT CASE
	§
<b>TOSHIBA AMERICA INFORMATION SYSTEMS, INC. ET AL</b>	§
	§
<b>AZURE NETWORKS, LLC,</b>	§
V.	§ CASE NO. 6:15-cv-29
	§ PATENT CASE
	§
<b>ZTE CORPORATION ET AL</b>	§
	§
<b>AZURE NETWORKS, LLC,</b>	§
V.	§ CASE NO. 6:15-cv-31
	§ PATENT CASE
	§
<b>INTEL CORPORATION</b>	§
	§
<b>AZURE NETWORKS, LLC,</b>	§
V.	§ CASE NO. 6:15-cv-32
	§ PATENT CASE
	§
<b>TEXAS INSTRUMENTS INC.</b>	§
	§
<b>AZURE NETWORKS, LLC,</b>	§
V.	§ CASE NO. 6:15-cv-33
	§ PATENT CASE
	§
<b>BROADCOM CORPORATION</b>	§
	§
<b>AZURE NETWORKS, LLC,</b>	§
V.	§ CASE NO. 6:15-cv-34
	§ PATENT CASE
	§
<b>QUALCOMM INCORPORATED ET AL</b>	§
	§

<b>AZURE NETWORKS, LLC,</b>	§
<b>V.</b>	§ CASE NO. 6:15-cv-35
	§ PATENT CASE
	§
<b>MARVELL SEMICONDUCTOR INC.</b>	§
	§
<hr/>	<hr/>
<b>AZURE NETWORKS, LLC,</b>	§
<b>V.</b>	§ CASE NO. 6:15-cv-36
	§ PATENT CASE
	§
<b>CSR PLC ET AL</b>	§
	§
	§
<hr/>	<hr/>
<b>AZURE NETWORKS, LLC,</b>	§
<b>V.</b>	§ CASE NO. 6:15-cv-37
	§ PATENT CASE
	§
<b>MEDIATEK INC. ET AL</b>	§
	§
	§
<hr/>	<hr/>
<b>AZURE NETWORKS, LLC,</b>	§
<b>V.</b>	§ CASE NO. 6:15-cv-39
	§ PATENT CASE
	§
<b>ASUS COMPUTER INTERNATIONAL ET AL</b>	§
	§
	§
<hr/>	<hr/>
<b>AZURE NETWORKS, LLC,</b>	§
<b>V.</b>	§ CASE NO. 6:15-cv-40
	§ PATENT CASE
	§
<b>DELL INC.</b>	§
	§
	§
<hr/>	<hr/>
<b>AZURE NETWORKS, LLC,</b>	§
<b>V.</b>	§ CASE NO. 6:15-cv-48
	§ PATENT CASE
	§
<b>VIZIO, INC.</b>	§
	§
	§
<hr/>	<hr/>

### **CONSOLIDATION ORDER**

The passage of the Leahy-Smith America Invents Act (“AIA”), which clarified the joinder requirements for cases alleging patent infringement, has resulted in a significant increase in the number of “serially” filed patent cases on the Court’s docket. Such serially filed or severed cases, by their nature, involve common issues of law or fact, including claim

construction and validity. “If actions before the Court involve a common question of law or fact, the court may: (1) join for hearing or trial any or all matters at issue in the actions; (2) consolidate the actions; or (3) issue any other orders to avoid unnecessary cost or delay.” FED. R. CIV. P. 42(a). In applying Rule 42, a court has considerable discretion. *In re EMC Corp.*, 677 F.3d at 1360; *see also Lurea v. M/V Albeta*, 625 F.3d 181, 194 (5th Cir. 2011) (“Rule 42(a) provides district courts with broad authority to consolidate actions that ‘involve a common question of law or fact.’”). Because the above-styled cases involve a common question of law or fact, consolidating these cases promotes efficient case management.

Accordingly, the Court **ORDERS** that the above-styled cases are consolidated for pretrial issues only, with the exception of venue. The earliest filed civil action (6:15-cv-18) shall serve as the lead case for consolidated issues. The Clerk of the Court shall add the consolidated defendants to the lead case, as well as Lead and Local Counsel only. Any other counsel who wishes to appear in the lead case shall file a notice of appearance in that case. The individual cases will remain active for venue motions and trial. Additionally, all pending motions will be considered as filed and without any prejudice due to consolidation. Should the parties file motions to transfer or motions to sever and transfer, the Court will consider these motions only as to the defendants in the originally filed (member) cases, not as to all defendants in the pretrial consolidated case.<sup>1</sup> *See Norman IP Holdings, LLC v. Lexmark Int'l, Inc.*, No. 6:12CV508, 2012 WL 3307942, at \*4 (E.D. Tex. Aug. 10, 2012). All future filings, other than venue motions, shall be filed in the consolidated case.

The local rules’ page limitations for *Markman* briefs and other motions will apply to the consolidated case. To further promote judicial economy and to conserve the parties’ resources,

---

<sup>1</sup> If one or more defendants wish to file a consolidated venue transfer motion, those defendants may, at their election, file consolidated briefing in the lead case that clearly indicates which defendants have joined the motion.

the Court encourages the parties to file a notice with the Court in the event that there are other related cases currently pending on the Court's docket, as well as any future cases Plaintiff intends to file, that may also be appropriate for consolidation with this case.

**SIGNED this 8th day of July, 2015.**

Robert W. Schroeder III  
ROBERT W. SCHROEDER III  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE